

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

This amendment is in response to an Office Action mailed March 7, 2006. In the Office Action, claim 10 was rejected under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph as being allegedly indefinite. In addition, claims 1-7, 9, 11-44, and 46-47 were rejected under 35 USC §102(e) as being anticipated by England (U.S. Patent No. 6,938,164). Claims 8 and 45 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over England in view of Schneier's Applied Cryptography (2<sup>nd</sup> Edition, 1996). Claim 10 is rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over England in view of a publication entitled ATPM-Review: Virtual PC 4.0 (April 2001). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection and respectfully requests reconsideration of the pending claims.

#### ***Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 112***

Claim 10 was rejected under 35 USC §112 as being allegedly definite for including trademark recitations. Upon review, Applicant has been unable to locate any trademark recitation within claim 10. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the outstanding §112 rejection.

#### ***Rejection under 35 USC § 102***

Claims 1-7, 9, 11-44, and 46-47 were rejected under 35 USC §102(e) as being anticipated by England. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection because a *prima facie* case has not been established. Applicant respectfully submits that a *prima facie* case has not been established with respect to the original claims, and more importantly, is clearly not applicable to amended independent claims 1, 12, 21, 32, and 39. These amended independent claims now generally include limitations set forth in original claims 8 or 45. Therefore Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the outstanding §102(e) rejection.

#### ***Claims Rejected under 35 USC § 102(e)***

Claims 8 and 45 were rejected under 35 USC § 1022(e) as being unpatentable over England in view of Applied Cryptography (2<sup>nd</sup> Edition, 1996). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection because *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established. In order to make a proper *prima facie* case of unpatentability of a claim, an Office Action must set forth, at a minimum, a combination of prior art patents which results in the subject matter residing in claim. See MPEP §2143.03 which states: "To establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974). 'All words in the claim must be considered in judging the patentability of that claim against the prior art.' *In re Wilson*, 424 F2d 1382, 1385, 165 USPQ 494, 496 (CCPA 1970)."

None of these cited references applied in the Office Action disclose an operation of registering an identity of the content of the identified region which comprises two steps: (1) recording a hash digest of the content of the identified region; and signing the signed hash digest being stored in a register in the memory of the computer that is accessible to a third party to

verify whether the content can be trusted. None of these references describe or suggest 3<sup>rd</sup> party verification as set forth in claim 8 and has been newly amended and added to the above-identified independent claims. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider the rejection based on the amendments set forth herein.

***Conclusion***

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: July 7, 2006

By

  
William W. Schaal

Reg. No. 39,018

Tel.: (714) 557-3800 (Pacific Coast)

12400 Wilshire Boulevard, Seventh Floor  
Los Angeles, California 90025

---

**CERTIFICATE OF MAILING/TRANSMISSION (37 CFR 1.84)**

*I hereby certify that this correspondence is, on the date shown below, being:*

**MAILING**

**FACSIMILE**

☒ deposited with the United States Postal Service  
as first class mail in an envelope addressed to:  
Commissioner for Patents, PO Box 1450,  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

☐ transmitted by facsimile to the Patent and  
Trademark Office.

Date: 07/07/06

  
Susan McFarlane

07/07/06

Date